

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,533	11/10/2003	Abaneshwar Prasad	100158	5405
29050 7590 04/16/2007 STEVEN WESEMAN ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL, I.P.			EXAMINER	
			MARCHESCHI, MICHAEL A	
	CABOT MICROELECTRONICS CORPORATION 870 NORTH COMMONS DRIVE			PAPER NUMBER
AURORA, IL	0504		1755	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
٠			04/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	<u></u>	
10/705,533	PRASAD, ABANESHWA	PRASAD, ABANESHWAR	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Michael A. Marcheschi	1755		

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet wi	ith the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 30 March 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITIO	N FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a N this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendr places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The time periods:	lotice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of ment, affidavit, or other evidence, which fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from t Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) W	he mailing date of the final rejection.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	HEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for is set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	gamount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 r	must be filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.3 a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set f AMENDMENTS	37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since
	no brief will not be entered because
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);	see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by mater appeal; and/or	erially reducing or simplifying the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	No. C. F. IA. I. (DTO) 00.0
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	,
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a se non-allowable claim(s). 	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or be how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	o) Will be entered and an explanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: <u>2,4 and 5</u> .	•
Claim(s) rejected: 1,3,6-8 and 13.	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	
3. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filed because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	ling a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered e affidavit or other evidence is necessary and
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but price entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier present.	er appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims	
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	·
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the appli ——————————————————————————————————	ication in condition for allowance because:
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). 13. ☐ Other: 	<u> //-</u>
	, //
	Michael A Marcheschi Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1755

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Application No. 10/705,533

Continuation of 3. NOTE: applicants state that amended claim 1 includes the limitations of claims 2, 4 and 5, which the examiner indicated as being allowable. Claim 1, as amended, defines that the polymer comprises a repeat unit selected from a specific group. This group includes the units recited in objected to claim 2, however, with respect to objected to claims 4 and 5, claims 4 and 5 define what the biodegradable polymer is and not what the repeat units are, thus the manner in which claims 4 and 5 have been incorporated into claim 1 (defining what the repeat units are) is improper because claims 4 and 5 specifically define the components listed as the biodegradable polymers and not repeat units. In view of this, this amendment raises an issue of the claim being indefinite because all of the groups are not repeat units (some are the biodegradable polymers).